

In the Office Action, claims 10, 13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sziebert, U.S. Patent No. 6,064,174 ("Sziebert"), and Skelton et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,257,175 ("Skelton"). Claim 11 was rejected as being anticipated by Skelton.

Independent claim 10 is directed toward a voice coil motor circuit for controlling current through a voice coil motor. The voice coil motor circuit includes first and second power amplifier circuits, each formed of a **single operational amplifier** and a feedback network. Claim 10 instructs that the single operational amplifier of the first power amplifier circuit connects to control regions of both first and third transistors of the H-bridge circuit (the single operational amplifier of the second power amplifier circuit connects to the control regions of both second and fourth transistors of the H-bridge circuit). Neither of the cited prior art references teach or suggest such a configuration. Both Sziebert and Skelton fail as an anticipatory reference for at least the reason that they do not teach or suggest each of a first and second power amplifier circuit being formed of a **single operational amplifier** connected to control regions of first and third (or second and fourth) transistors.

In the Office Action regarding Sziebert, the first power amplifier circuit is cited as "a combination of **single operation amplifier 82** and the feedback network from the output of amplifier 83 through FET 72, through the voice coil motor and back to amplifier 82 **through amp 100.**" (Page 2, paragraph 3). Thus, the Office Action admits that this power amplifier circuit includes **two** operational amplifiers, and **not a single** operational amplifier as recited by claim 10. The claim language cannot be avoided by locating the second amplifier in the feedback network. Further, operational amplifier 82 does not connect to control regions of both FETs 72 and 76, except through operational amplifier 86. For at least these reasons, Sziebert does not anticipate the invention of claim 10.

Skelton also fails as an anticipatory reference for failure to teach or suggest each of a first and a second power amplifier circuit having a **single operational amplifier**. It is urged in the Office Action that the first power amplifier circuit can be considered the combination of one of amplifiers 30, 32 and the feedback network connected between the input nodes 42, 44 and the selected amplifier (e.g., the

feedback network would be between node 44 and the inverting input of amplifier 32 (through diode 34, and FET 12)." This recited circuit, however, fails to meet the claim language. **Amplifier 30** connects to the control region of switch 12 only **through amplifier 32**. Similarly, **amplifier 32** connects to the control region of switch 18 only **through amplifier 30**. Thus, the power amplifier circuit necessary includes at least **two** operational amplifiers, and **not a single** operational amplifier as recited by claim 10. For at least this reason, Skelton does not anticipate the invention of claim 10.

Because the circuits of Sziebert and Skelton do not teach or suggest the invention of claim 10, the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) should be withdrawn. Claims 11 and 13-22, which each depend from claim 10, are allowable for the same reasons a claim 10.

The present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 3/25/2005

By: 

Dina M. Khaled, Reg. No. 52,761
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

DMK:bs